

## **REMARKS**

The Official Action dated October 28, 2008, the Examiner rejected pending claims 1,3-5,8-13, 18, 29, 31-39 and 41-69. Applicant requests that the examiner reconsider the rejection of the claims in light of the amendments to the claims and the following discussion.

The Examiner has recognized that the prior art does not teach Applicants' apparatus and method, however, the Examiner has cobbled together various pieces of numerous references in an attempt to show that the apparatus and method are obvious combinations. Although Applicants' believe that the apparatus and method as previously claimed are not suggested by the cited references, the claims have been amended to further distinguish the cited references. Specifically, none of the references alone or in combination show a system that scans for address information, weighs the pieces, prints an applies a label onto pieces if the address information is properly determined within a predetermined time frame or prints and applies a label having an identification number if the address information for the piece cannot be determined. By doing so, Applicants' system can more readily automatically process rejected pieces that minimize further processing.

Respectfully submitted,

DANN, DORFMAN, HERRELL & SKILLMAN  
A Professional Corporation  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By /Stephen Eland/  
PTO Registration No. 41,010

Telephone: (215) 563-4100  
Facsimile: (215) 563-4044